UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/632,701	07/31/2003	David Wong	13914-028001 / 2003P00198	3616	
32864 7590 01/03/2007 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.			EXAMINER		
PO BOX 1022	·		HAMILTON, LALITA M		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3691		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
· 3 MONTHS		01/03/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office floring Comment	10/632,701	WONG, DAVID					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Lalita M. Hamilton	3691					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the state of the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was a failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION OF THIS COMMUNION OF THIS COMMUNION OF THE STATE	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 At	ugust 2006.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are rejected.		·					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	•						
. •							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		Informal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

Application/Control Number: 10/632,701

Art Unit: 3691

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Summary

On February 1, 2006, an Office Action was sent to the Applicant rejecting claims 1-37. On August 4, 2006, the Applicant responded with arguments.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 12-21, 23-24, 27-32, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer (6,356,909) in view of Albazz (2002/0046081).

Spencer discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth in the previous Office Action. However, Spencer does not disclose compliances rules. Albazz teaches the use of compliance rules for requests and bidding (p.5, 56-59 and p.8, 99-103). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Application/Control Number: 10/632,701

Art Unit: 3691

invention was made to incorporate compliance rules to allow the bidding to provide for the best possible responses.

Claims 7, 22, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer and Albazz as applied to claims 1 and 16, and in further view of Lee (US 2002/0615814), as set forth in the previous Office Action.

Claims 10-11, 25-26, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer and Albazz as applied to claims 1, 16, and 27 above, and in further view of Tenorio (US 2003/0208424), as set forth in the previous Office Action.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-37 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lalita M. Hamilton whose telephone number is (571) 272-6743. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday (6:30-2:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kalinowski Alexander can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/632,701

Art Unit: 3691

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lalita M. Hamilton

Primary Examiner, 3691